

• REMARKS

Claims 506-557, 559-607, 609-615, and 610-615 are currently pending. Claims 551-557, and 592 have been allowed, and claims 506-550, 559-591, 593-607, and 609-615 stand rejected.

In the accompanying amendment, claims 534, 542, 544, 587, 597, and 598 have been cancelled, and claims 516, 530, 532, 536, 537, 540, 543, 545, 546, 559, 583, 585, 586, 589, 593, 594, 599, and 614 have been amended. Support for the amendments to the claims may be found in the written description, claims, and drawings of the specification as originally filed. Thus, the amendments to the claims do not add new matter. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that the accompanying amendment is suitable for entry under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 since the amendment places the application in condition for allowance. It is to be noted that the amendments to the claims are to better define the invention and are not in response to arguments regarding patentability presented by the Examiner.

In the Office Action under reply, it is stated that:

- (1) "any instructions which are executed based on registers are register-based instructions" and

(Page 2, Office Action mailed 13 July, 2005)

- (2) "operations or instructions which are performed by the registers, are all register-based instructions"

(Page 3, Office Action mailed 13 July, 2005).

Registers may be regarded as hardware storage elements and can be found in processors that execute stack-based instructions and in processors that execute register-based instructions. If the Examiner's argument that "any instructions which are executed based on registers are register-based instructions" is correct then the distinction between stack-based instructions and register-based instructions would be lost. However, given that a distinction is maintained between stack-based and register-based instructions in the literature, it follows that said distinction cannot be founded upon whether or not an instruction is executed "based on registers". Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's argument that "any instructions which are executed based on registers are register-based instructions" is not correct.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider Applicants arguments presented in the Response mailed March 17, 2005 in the light of the foregoing.

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the remarks set forth herein, all rejections have been overcome. All pending claims are now in condition for allowance, which is earnestly solicited. Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account 503437 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicant hereby requests such an extension.

Respectfully submitted,

HAHN AND MOODLEY LLP

Dated: July 26, 2005

Suite 180
800 W El Camino Real
Mountain View, CA 94040



Vani Moodley (Registration No. 56,631)